


REMARKS

In the last Action, restriction was required between claims 1-4 drawn to a method and claims 5 and 6 drawn to an apparatus. The Examiner stated that the two inventions are patentably distinct from each other, thereby making restriction proper. Applicants were required to elect one of the two inventions for further prosecution in this application.

In response to the restriction requirement, applicants have provisionally elected the invention of Group I drawn to a method and submit that claims 1-4 are readable on the elected invention. The non-elected claims have been retained in the application pending possible withdrawal of the restriction requirement or applicants' decision to pursue the subject matter thereof in a continuing application.



RECEIVED  
JUN 02 2003  
TC 1700

In light of the foregoing, early and favorable  
action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ADAMS & WILKS  
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Bruce L. Adams  
Reg. No. 25,386


50 Broadway  
31st Floor  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 809-3700

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS NON-FEE AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Michael Ruas

Name

  
Signature

May 27, 2003

Date